

From: Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US
Sent: 3/20/2012 11:58:18 PM
To: "Abrahm Lustgarten" <Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org>
CC: "Roy Seneca" <seneca.roy@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Dimock research

Abrahm,

Apologies for the delay. Please note that EPA will be releasing a compilation of the analytical data, available so far, of the private residential wells sampled in Dimock. This information will be made available on the Agency's website soon and will follow the requirements of the Privacy Act.

What is the trigger level by the EPA's definition in the context of the Dimock results? What does it refer to and what are its consequences?

Answer: EPA highlighted parameters in the results to trigger a review by a toxicologist and to expedite a quality assurance review. EPA conducted those reviews and found no health concerns; our summary statement to the residents notes that we did not identify any health concerns. EPA officials can explain these results more thoroughly in our meeting with individual homeowners.

Is the decision to release news about Dimock inconsistent with what happened in Pavillion and why?

Answer: EPA did two phases of sampling in Pavillion, Wyoming that included residential wells. In both cases we shared the analytical data with each residence and also held a public session for residents to speak to us about the results. For more information visit,

<http://www.epa.gov/region8/superfund/wy/pavillion/> <<http://www.epa.gov/region8/superfund/wy/pavillion/>>

Why are some of the following not characterized in EPA's statement about Dimock's water released Thursday:

* Low levels of pyrene, benzoprene, fluorine, fluoranthene, dinutrotoluene, hexachlorobenzene, phthalates, etc?

Answer: Rather than characterize in our statement the results of all 225 parameters sampled for, we focused on those parameters that were detected above trigger levels, which were set to guide us in flagging potential health concerns.

*High levels of methane with Ethane, which normally signifies thermogenic sourcing.

Answer: We are working on getting back to you on this question.

*Metals including chromium, lithium and lead – Lithium in particular are fairly high levels in some samples.

Answer: Here, again, we did not characterize all the parameters, and plan to discuss these issues with homeowners in our upcoming meetings.

One of the water samples in Dimock contained a positive detection for benzo[a]pyrene at levels that exceed the EPA's maximum contaminant level. (detected .20 ug/L vs 0 ug/L MCL). I realize this is a minute amount, but the chemical is defined as such by the EPA and described as a probable human carcinogen that has caused tumors in animals.

How can the general characterization of the collective drinking water results be that they posed no health threat, given this detection?

If there is something I'm misunderstanding here, or detail that should be added, please let me know soon!

Answer: The MCL for benzo[a]pyrene is .20 ug/L and not 0 ug/L. EPA's review of our sampling data from the 11 wells identified two wells where benzo[a]pyrene was detected. Both of these wells had detections (0.16 ug/L and .049 ug/L) that were below the MCL of .20 ug/L. (Please note that there was a printing error with the MCL tables on some of the materials distributed to residents. Part of a column was chopped off. We are reprinting those tables and redistributing them to residents.)

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

From: Abrahm Lustgarten [Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org]

Sent: 03/19/2012 03:21 AM AST

To: Roy Seneca; Terri-A White

Cc: Betsaida Alcantara

Subject: Dimock research

Hi Roy,

I'll be working on an important story about developments in Dimock and the EPA's research there, probably for today, Monday. I'd like to speak with you, and hopefully with someone in a scientific/research capacity from the EPA tomorrow afternoon, if possible. I have some questions about the research itself, about what is in the water in Dimock, and about the agency's decision to release the preliminary findings last Thursday.

I'm on the west coast, and will have a complicated schedule and limited availability before about 2 p.m. Eastern, so I'm writing this email now hoping that we can get things rolling in advance of then, and then talk at 2.

In the mean time, I'd also like to ask if you can share the water testing results. I have yet to see them on the EPA website or in your release, and so I'm hoping you have digital copies and might be able to email them to me first thing in the morning. If you can't identify the property owners, I presume you can just block out their identifying information as has been done in the past and share the raw data. Thank you, and I look forward to seeing the test data and following up in conversation tomorrow.

Regards,

Abrahm Lustgarten

ProPublica

917-589-1262